## **REMARKS**

Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of former dependent claim 5.

Former dependent claim 5 was rejected based on Greene '328. However, Greene '328 does not show any gaps between the cover plate 14. Therefore, Greene cannot contribute to an obviousness rejection of claim 1 as amended. Reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claim 6 calls for the filler material to match the optical characteristic of the integrated plates. Since there is no filler material or gap, claim 6 should also be in condition for allowance.

On a similar analysis, the remaining claims should likewise be patentable.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 24, 2003

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994

TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C. 8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100

Houston, TX 77024 713/468-8880 [Phone]

713/468-8883 [Fax]